

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

John H. Glenn Research Center
Lewis Field
21000 Brookpark Road
Cleveland, OH 44135-3191



SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
Millwright Trade Services Blanket Purchase Agreement
Request for Proposal NNC14ZCH010R

Background

This procurement is to establish a Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) under which the contractor shall provide all supervision, personnel, material, equipment, and supplies necessary to successfully perform and complete Millwright trade services throughout NASA Glenn Research Center (GRC). To accomplish this effort, the Government will award a single BPA for a time period of one year.

A Request for Quote (RFQ) was issued June 30, 2014, through the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS). Two proposals were received by the due date of July 31, 2014, from Chemsteel Construction Company and Tesar Industrial Contractors.

Evaluation Results

The proposals were evaluated in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 12.6 - Streamlined Procedures for Evaluation and Solicitation for Commercial Items. The proposals were evaluated considering three factors: Technical Capability, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Price. Among the three Factors, all were considered equal in importance. Within the Technical Capability Factor there were 3 sub areas which were considered equal in importance. The summary results are indicated below:

Chemsteel Construction Company

Overall under Technical Capability, Chemsteel was rated "above average". The proposal was rated "outstanding" to "above average" throughout the three sub areas.

The proposal provided a detailed description of equipment receiving, equipment Handling and rigging, equipment erection & alignment, QA/QC, security, and a site specific Health & Safety Plan. This was considered a strength.

The proposal provided a descriptive plan on how they planned on providing project management for multiple projects; addressed the interaction with the CO & the COR; included 2 Superintendents, and two project managers; discussed the constantly monitoring safety, and job progress; and addressed the ability to increase management resources as the need arises due to workload requirements. This was considered a strength.

The proposal included highly qualified key personnel. The Project managers are college educated, highly qualified, with extensive experience at GRC. This was considered a significant strength.

Overall in Relevant Experience and Past Performance, Chemsteel was rated "Outstanding". Chemsteel was deemed to have highly relevant work experience. Chemsteel currently has the NASA Glenn contract for this type of work. Based on the information provided in the client questionnaires, Chemsteel received a preponderance of "outstanding" and "very good" ratings. NASA personnel stated Chemsteel has done a very good job in their performance on NASA work.

The Pricing proposal was considered complete. The proposal included fully-burdened pricing for the labor categories considered necessary for projects to be awarded and included costs for equipment and other items typically required for these types of projects. The proposal had the lowest overall pricing of the two Offerors received by an average of 1% on labor rates. The equipment list was extensive, and the average comparable savings from the other Offeror was over 10%.

Tesar Industrial Contractors

Overall in the Technical Capability, Tesar rated "Satisfactory." The proposal contained one "above average" rating and two "satisfactory" ratings in the sub areas.

The proposal provided a limited description outlining the Offeror's ability to complete the requirements of the SOW; a listing of union memberships; discussion of QA/QC; and a site specific Health & Safety Plan. This was considered to meet the requirements.

The proposal provided limited details on providing project management for multiple projects simultaneously; addressed the interaction with the COR; included a Superintendent, and a project manager; and discussed that they will be constantly monitoring safety, and job progress. This was considered to meet the requirements.

The proposal included qualified key personnel. The qualifications included apprentice programs, on the job experience, and experience at GRC. This was considered a strength.

Overall in Relevant Experience and Past Performance, Tesar was rated "Outstanding". Tesar was deemed to have highly relevant work experience citing a number of NASA projects. Based on the information provided in the client questionnaires, Tesar received a preponderance of "outstanding" ratings. NASA personnel stated Tesar has done a very good job in their performance on NASA work.

The Pricing proposal was considered complete. The proposal included fully-burdened pricing for the labor categories considered necessary for projects to be awarded and the costs for equipment typically required for these types of projects. Their pricing was the higher of the two offers.

Decision

I have reviewed the evaluation findings of both offers and discussed the findings with the assigned contract specialist. I understand the process used to evaluate the offers and agree with the findings. I also understand the three Factors are essentially equal in importance.

In the Technical Capability Factor, I find that Chemsteel was rated "Above Average". I note that Chemsteel had "outstanding" to "above average" ratings in the sub areas with a number of strengths, including a significant strength. Of particular note were the qualifications and experience of the key personnel with direct experience at GRC. This was considered a significant strength by the evaluators. I consider ChemSteel sub area ratings to represent a proposal fully responsive to the RFP.

I find that Tesar was rated "Satisfactory". I note that Tesar was rated "above average" in one sub area and "satisfactory" in two sub areas. I find that the Tesar proposal was not to the same level of detail as

the Chemsteel proposal and was considered by the evaluation team to meet many of the technical requirements while the Chemsteel proposal contained multiple strengths. I therefore consider the Chemsteel proposal, which was consistently rated higher than the Tesar proposal, to offer advantages over the Tesar proposal.

In the area of Relevant Experience and Past Performance, I note that Chemsteel was rated "Outstanding". The provided questionnaires indicated both highly relevant experience and successful past performance. I note that Chemsteel is performing on the current work effort at GRC. Tesar was also rated as "Outstanding". Tesar had multiple highly relevant projects and successful past performance.

In direct comparison, I find both firms to be rated "Outstanding" with highly relevant experience and successful past performance. I consider this past experience and performance to be strong indicators of successful performance in the future. I do find that both firms have direct experience at GRC on different contract efforts. With the direct experience by both firms at GRC, I consider both firms to be relatively equal in this Factor.

In the area of Price, I find that both firms provided complete pricing information. I find that Chemsteel provide rates were slightly lower than the Tesar rates. Due to these slightly lower rates, I consider Chemsteel to have a slight advantage in this area.

Based on the above, I find Chemsteel to have a distinct advantage in Technical Capability and slight advantage in Price. I consider both firms essentially equal in Relevant Experience and Past Performance. I consider the Chemsteel to be fully capable of performing the work effort with direct experience on the current contract. I consider Chemsteel to have provided the superior proposal and to have offered the best value to the Government.

I therefore select the Chemsteel Construction Company to perform the requirements as outlined in the solicitation NNC14ZCH010R.


Ronald Sepesi
Chief, Institutional Services Branch

August 25, 2014
Date